



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,987	11/14/2001	David W. Camarillo	41698-1045	7662

7590 03/25/2004
Alex L. Yip
Kaye Scholer LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/992,987

Applicant(s)

CAMARILLO, DAVID W.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The Applicant's claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e), based on a provisional of application serial number 60/314,722, filed on August 24, 2001, is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. The drawings were received on 14 February 2002. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kane et al.** ("Kane") (U.S. Patent 6,389,429) in view of **Seilhamer et al.** ("Seilhamer") (U.S. Patent 6,023,659).

Regarding claim 1, **Kane** teaches a method for maintaining records in a database comprising:

Art Unit: 2177

a). **'receiving at least a collection of first data items and a collection of second data items, at least one of the first data items being associated with one of the second data items'** as processing source databases because record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical. It is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but the data within the databases may be inconsistent (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49);

b). **'disposing the first data items in a plurality of fields arranged in a predetermined format to form a first assemblage'** as it is necessary to extract data from *each* source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23);

c). **'disposing the second data items in a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format to form a second assemblage'** as it is necessary to extract data from *each* source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database. Moreover, it may be desirable to use multiple source databases to update the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23; col. 8, lines 23-35);

e). **'maintaining a record, in the database, having a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format'** as the target database 108 of audience member records may have any desired record layout, but the indicated layout is suitable (col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 14); and

f). **including in a field in the record a selected one of (1) the first data items in the predetermined nomenclature and (2) the second data items in the predetermined nomenclature'** as for each field group in the new target database record, the source database is specified for the fields name datasource_id, address_datasource_id, phone_datasource_id, and email_datasource_id, to indicate that the new target record information came from the particular source database (col. 12, lines 20-27).

d). **Kane** does not explicitly teach modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches **'modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature'** as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to "man, "homo sapeins", and "human" etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as "human" (col. 27, lines 55-59).

Art Unit: 2177

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Seilhamer's** teaching would have allowed **Kane's** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the pre-determined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 2, **Kane** further teaches '**wherein at (b) and (c) the first data items and the second data items are separated, rearranged, or combined to form the first assemblage and the second assemblage respectively**' as the source data is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 3, **Kane** further teaches '**wherein at (f) the first data items and the second data items are assigned accuracy rankings and are selected based upon their accuracy rankings**' as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match. Data in the target database always being kept up to date and only source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 4, **Kane** further teaches a system for maintaining records in a database comprising:

Art Unit: 2177

a). **'communications interface for receiving at least a collection of first data items and a collection of second data items, at least one of the first data items being associated with one of the second data items'** as processing source databases because record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical. It is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but the data within the databases may be inconsistent (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49);

b). **'a converter for disposing the first data items in a plurality of fields arranged in a predetermined format to form a first assemblage, and for disposing the second data items in a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format to form a second assemblage'** as it is necessary to extract data from each source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database and when the data table from the extraction process from the source data is created, it will be known how fields in the table correspond, or map, to data in the target database per step 202 of Fig. 2. Moreover, it may be desirable to use multiple source databases to update the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23; col. 8, lines 23-35);

d). **'a database for maintaining a record, in the database, having a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format'** as the target database 108

of audience member records may have any desired record layout, but the indicated layout is suitable (col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 14); and

e). **'a data masher for including in a field in the record a selected one of (1) the first data items in the predetermined nomenclature and (2) the second data items in the predetermined nomenclature'** as for each field group in the new target database record, the source database is specified for the fields name `datasource_id`, `address_datasource_id`, `phone_datasource_id`, and `email_datasource_id`, to indicate that the new target record information came from the particular source database (col. 12, lines 20-27).

c). **Kane** does not explicitly teach a normalizer for modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches **'modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature'** as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to "man", "homo sapeins", and "human" etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as "human" (col. 27, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Seilhamer's teaching would have allowed **Kane's** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the pre-determined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 5, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'each of the of the first assemblage of data items and the second assemblage of data items in the predetermined nomenclature are associated with data accuracy rankings'** as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 6, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'the data masher selected the first data items and the second data items based upon the data accuracy rankings'** as source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 7, **Kane** further teaches a system for maintaining records in a database comprising:

a). **'a converter for converting a collection of first data items and a collection of second data items to a plurality of fields arranged in a predetermined format to form a first assemblage of data items and a second assemblage of data items, at least one of the first data items being associated**

Art Unit: 2177

with one of the second data items' as record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical and it is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but that data within the databases may be inconsistent. It is necessary to extract data from *each* source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database and compare the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49; col. 9, lines 18-57);

c). **'a database for maintaining a record, in the database, having a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format'** as the target database 108 of audience member records may have any desired record layout, but the indicated layout is suitable (col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 14); and

d). **'a data masher for selecting at least one data item from the first assemblage of data items in the predetermined nomenclature, selecting data items from the second assemblage of data items in the predetermined nomenclature, and combining the at least one data items and the data items from the second assemblage to create the record'** as comparing the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 9, lines 18-57; col. 4, lines 30-50);

b). **Kane** does not explicitly teach a normalizer for converting selected ones of the first assemblage of data items and the second assemblage of data items to conform to a predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches '**converting selected ones of the first assemblage of data items and the second assemblage of data items to conform to a predetermined nomenclature**' as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to "man," "homo sapeins", and "human" etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as "human" (col. 27, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Seilhamer's** teaching would have allowed **Kane's** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the pre-determined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 8, **Kane** further teaches wherein '**the converter separates, rearranges, or combines data to form the first assemblage of data items and the second assemblage of data items**' as the source data is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 9, Kane further teaches wherein 'each of the of the first assemblage of data items and the second assemblage of data items in the predetermined nomenclature are associated with data accuracy rankings' as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 10, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'the data masher selected the first data items and the second data items based upon the data accuracy rankings'** as source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 11, **Kane** further teaches a system for maintaining records in a database comprising:

a). **'a converter for converting a collection of first records having fields and data items into uniform records having fields and data items organized into a uniform format and where each of the uniform records have one or more of the data items conforming to a predetermined nomenclature and a balance of the one or more data items not conforming to the predetermined nomenclature'** as record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical and it is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but that data within the databases may be inconsistent. It is necessary to extract data from *each* source database so that the extracted data will be

broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database and compare the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49; col. 9, lines 18-57);

c). **'a data masher for selecting equivalent records from the collection of second records and selecting data items from the equivalent records for combining into a third record having the selected data items arranged in the uniform format and stored in the database'** as comparing the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 9, lines 18-57; col. 4, lines 30-50).

b). **Kane** does not explicitly teach a normalizer for converting the balance of the one or more data items to the predetermined nomenclature, producing a collection of second records each having the one or more of the data items that conform to a predetermined nomenclature and the balance of the one or more data items that are in the predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches **'converting the balance of the one or more data items to the predetermined nomenclature, producing a collection of second records each having the one or more of the data items that conform to a predetermined nomenclature and the balance of the one or more data items that**

Art Unit: 2177

are in the predetermined nomenclature' as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to "man, "homo sapeins", and "human" etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as "human" (col. 27, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Seilhamer's** teaching would have allowed **Kane's** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the pre-determined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 12, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'the converter separates, rearranges, or combines the fields and the data items form the first records, into the uniform format'** as the source data is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 13, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'before the normalizer converts the balance of the one or more data items, it separates the one or more data items into components'** as it is necessary to extract data from each source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 14, **Kane** further teaches wherein **'the data masher selects equivalent records by comparing the data items in the second records on a field-by-field basis and determines a confidence level value of the second records based upon the similarities of the data items in the second records, and determining that the second records are equivalent if the confidence level values are above a predetermined threshold level value'** as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match. Data in the target database always being kept up to date and only source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 15, **Kane** further teaches software recordable in a tangible medium which includes machine readable instructions from performing a process for building a database, which stores records corresponding to a plurality of data items, the process comprising:

a). **'receiving at least a collection of first data items and a collection of second data items, at least one of the first data items being associated with one of the second data items'** as processing source databases because record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical and it is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but that data within the databases may be inconsistent (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49);

b). **'disposing the first data items in a plurality of fields arranged in a predetermined format to form a first assemblage'** as it is necessary to extract data from each source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23);

c). **'disposing the second data items in a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format to form a second assemblage'** as it is necessary to extract data from each source database so that the extracted data will be broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database. Moreover, it may be desirable to use multiple source databases to update the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23; col. 8, lines 23-35);

e). **'maintaining a record, in the database, having a plurality of fields arranged in the predetermined format'** as the target database 108 of audience member records may have any desired record layout, but the indicated layout is suitable (col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 14); and

f). **'including in a field in the record a selected one of (1) the first data items in the predetermined nomenclature and (2) the second data items in the predetermined nomenclature'** as for each field group in the new target database

Art Unit: 2177

record, the source database is specified for the fields name datasource_id, address_datasource_id, phone_datasource_id, and email_datasource_id, to indicate that the new target record information came from the particular source database (col. 12, lines 20-27).

d). **Kane** does not explicitly teach modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches ‘**modifying selected ones of the first data items and the second data items to conform to predetermined nomenclature**’ as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to “man, “homo sapeins”, and “human” etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as “human” (col. 27, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Seilhamer’s** teaching would have allowed **Kane’s** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the predetermined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 16, **Kane** further teaches ‘**wherein at (b) and (c) the first data items and the second data items are separated, rearranged, or combined to form the first assemblage and the second assemblage respectively**’ as the source data

is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 17, **Kane** further teaches **'wherein at (f) the first data items and the second data items are assigned accuracy rankings and are selected based upon their accuracy rankings'** as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match. Data in the target database always being kept up to date and only source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 18, **Kane** further teaches a method for maintaining records in a database comprising:

a). **'converting a collection of first records having fields and data items into uniform records having fields and data items organized into a uniform format and where each of the uniform records have one or more of the data items conforming to a predetermined nomenclature and a balance of the one or more data items not conforming to the predetermined nomenclature'** as record layouts between various source databases 101, 102, and 103 and the target database will not be identical and it is likely that different databases contain information about the same audience member, but that data within the databases may be inconsistent. It is necessary to extract data from *each* source database so that the extracted data will be

Art Unit: 2177

broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database and compare the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 7, lines 17-23; Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 30-49; col. 9, lines 18-57);

c). **'selecting equivalent records from the collection of second records and selecting data items from the equivalent records for combining into a third record having the selected data items arranged in the uniform format and stored in the database'** as comparing the source records and update the target database with selected source records that have a higher accuracy ranking (col. 9, lines 18-57; col. 4, lines 30-50).

b). **Kane** does not explicitly teach converting the balance of the one or more data items to the predetermined nomenclature, producing a collection of second records each having the one or more of the data items that conform to a predetermined nomenclature and the balance of the one or more data items that are in the predetermined nomenclature.

Seilhamer, however, teaches **'converting the balance of the one or more data items to the predetermined nomenclature, producing a collection of second records each having the one or more of the data items that conform to a predetermined nomenclature and the balance of the one or more data items that are in the predetermined nomenclature'** as a species filter may be employed to

Art Unit: 2177

standardize all references to a particular species. For example, GenBank references to "man, "homo sapeins", and "human" etc. as well as misspellings of these words are all converted to a standard term such as "human" (col. 27, lines 55-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because **Seilhamer's** teaching would have allowed **Kane's** to provide more accurate search results by standardizes the data from various sources to conform with the pre-determined nomenclature as suggested in (col. 27, lines 14-23; col. 27, lines 61-62).

Regarding claim 19, **Kane** further teaches '**wherein the fields and the data items, from the first records, are separated, rearranged, or combined**' as the source data is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 20, **Kane** further teaches wherein '**the balance of the one or more data items are separated into components**' as the source data is broken down into fields formatted to match the format of corresponding fields of the target database (col. 7, lines 17-23).

Kane does not explicitly teach converting the balance of the one or more data items into the *predetermined nomenclature*.

Seilhamer, however, teaches **'converting the balance of the one or more data items into the predetermined nomenclature'** as a species filter may be employed to standardize all references to a particular species (col. 27, lines 55-59).

Regarding claim 21, Kane further teaches wherein **'equivalent records are selected by comparing the data items in the second records on a field-by-field basis and determining a confidence level value of the second records based upon the similarities of the data items in the second records, and determining that the second records are equivalent if the confidence level values are above a predetermined threshold level value'** as the scoring criteria is applied to determine minimum threshold for a match and which record has the highest ranking for a match. Data in the target database always being kept up to date and only source records that have a higher accuracy ranking than the fields in the target database are updated (col. 9, lines 18-58 and abstract; col. 12, lines 60-67).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,664,109A issued to Johnson et al. on 02 September 1997. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 2, 8, 16, and 19 (e.g. extracting pre-defined data items)

U.S. Patent 6,154,748A issued to Gupta et al. on 28 November 2000. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 2 and 12 (e.g. mapping data between different record formats).

U.S. Patent 5,781,773A issued to Vanderpool et al. on 14 July 1998. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 2 and 12 (e.g. formatting and aligning data records of a plurality of objects to a common table mapped format).

U.S. Patent 5,504,890A issued to Sanford on 02 April 1996. The subject matter disclosed therein is pertinent to that of claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 11-16, 18, 19, and 21 (e.g. data sharing among independently-operating information-gathering entities with conflict resolution rules).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 305-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2177

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2177

LW
19 March 2004